Committee members present in-person:

Mark Cimino
Jane Van Dyke-Perez
Joe Rodrigues
Maria Morris
Jim Morris
Megan Geremia
Estrella Manio

Committee members present via conference call:

Frond Hausey
Linda Conti
Jody Speigel
Claire Matsushita
Eric Dowdy
Josh Allen
Denise Johnson

Department Staff:

Brenda Barner
Robert Bayles
Bettye Griffin
Henry Noriega
Anastasia Fotis
Jennifer Encalade
Cathy Ballantine
Erik Santos
Esmeralda Rivas
Traci Waters
Brett Tillett

Committee members not present:

Call to order

Brenda Barner, Technical Assistance Bureau Chief and Robert Bayles, Manager of the
Administrator Certification Section (ACS), called the Administrator Section Certification

Advisory Committee (ACSAC) to order. The meeting was held in Office Building 9, Room 203, Department of Social Services at 744 P Street, Sacramento, CA.   Anastasia Fotis, ACS Analyst, recorded the meeting minutes.

Brenda and Robert welcomed the group.

Brenda requested to add to the agenda that ACS will now be scrutinizing curriculum received for approval, and that there may be a work group put together to examine how we are going to look at curriculum.

Robert called attention to the previous minutes and asked for any changes or revisions. Cathy Ballantine requested to add that there was a discussion of AB 1570 and SB 911, as they both relate to the Core of Knowledge.

Once the Core of Knowledge is complete, ACS wants to get it up on the website for vendors as they begin to create courses and outlines. After some minor edits, the Core of Knowledge was declared final.

Old Business

Robert asked that everyone fill out a profile, if they hadn't already completed one at the last meeting, and announced that ACS has some certificates of appreciation to hand out at the end of the meeting.

New Business

20 Hours. Robert and Brenda opened up the discussion for ideas on the other 20 hours of the ITCP, as new statutes mandate 60 of the upcoming 80 hours are in-class, and contain no specification how the remaining 20 hours are to be spent. Some topics lend themselves to in-class, while others would be more appropriate as an online option, provided technology is up to date enough to support it. We are exploring options and flexibility with the 20 hours at the discretion of the Department and the education providers working together. It may look different through different vendors. The Department is open to an online option with interactive criteria. Brett stated that whatever the 20 hours is, it must be conducive to learning and measurable. Robert confirmed that the 20 hours could certainly be done in-class as well. Josh stressed that we need to remember we are educating adults, and that it is more up to them to prepare themselves as students to pass the exam with less focus from the Department on attendance. Brenda agreed, but that the focus is on the quality of the curriculum and approval is based on Department criteria, making sure courses are quality courses.

Curriculum. Brenda started a new topic, discussing how the Department will look at curriculum. What the vendors want to do will vary from vendor to vendor, and each will be evaluated in a very objective manner. The discussion topics were: options,

flexibility, needs of the community, in-class vs. technology, curriculum quality in line with objectives and the Core of Knowledge. Brett added that there is a possibility that we (the Department) may have to get regulations to build parameters as we move forward. Jane asked when the Department would like to see the classes. Brenda replied that we have been waiting for the final Core of Knowledge, and that a letter will be sent out with a date; however, we will start taking them as soon as vendors have them ready. Robert asked if there will be a possibility for suggestions or public comment, and Brett replied yes, plus the regulations might not be promulgated. Despite that fact, statute controls and existing guidelines will go into effect. Cathy added that the implementations plans for 2014 are currently up on the website, and they will be good to use as vendors develop curriculum.

Exam Proctoring. Robert moved on to the next topic of exam proctoring. He stated that in addition to revising the RCFE exam, the team is now out proctoring at all regional offices. A question was asked about situation-based testing, and if the Department is taking into consideration the language barriers that exist among the examinees. Robert commented that questions are written with the least amount of confusion as possible, and that it must measure the learning based on the regulations, which are written in English. With the testing team and the working group, the process is probably the best that it can be. Brenda added that the exam is going to be 100 questions, and that examinees will have access to regulations and statutes.

Vendor Reviews. Brenda commented on some of the findings with the analysts' recent vendor reviews. These findings include outlines not matching what is actually being taught and releasing students early from class. By the next meeting, the Department will have completed more reviews, and will include information in the *Insider* on what the vendor analysts are seeing and what they would like to see.

Update Service. Brenda asked for ideas on how everyone gets information. The *Insider* has a link to regulation updates and policy. Suggestions were made to capture emails on the administrator application, and that people can subscribe to MyCCL or some sort of update service. Statute supports this:

1569.155.

Upon initial licensure, residential care facilities for the elderly shall be provided a printed copy of all applicable regulations by the department, without charge. All licensees shall subscribe to the appropriate regulation subscription service and are responsible for keeping current on changes in regulatory requirements.
(Added by Stats. 1985, Ch. 1127, Sec. 3.)

Break

Open Agenda.

- Cathy discussed that SB 911 and AB 1570 are drafted and in process, and waiting for direction to find out if they will be able to be shared with stakeholders before approved. Implementations will roll out in time order.
- A suggestion was made that we look at citations and deficiencies in developing exam questions on the following topics: operating without a license, transfer of license and consequences (add this to COK and orientation as well), home health/hospice, clients not for sale, property management companies' involvement, criminal liability, licensee vs. administrator responsibilities, room and board vs. RCFE, medications.
- Moving forward, focus with vendors will be how the Department approves courses.
- A question was asked to whether or not Licensing has an advisory committee for licensing operations. There was mention that maybe there is a subgroup of a formerly existing group, and to contact Pam Dickfoss.
- Question: How do we become a stakeholder? Answer: We look at who's out there, but realize we don't capture everyone who is interested. Those interested can let Robert or Brenda know.
- Brenda expressed the vision is to have this process happen over all of the programs; revising exams and Core of Knowledge, form a committee, and keep a spirit of transparency moving forward. For those interested in ARF and GH, let Robert know.
- How often shall the ACS Advisory Committee continue to meet? We will continue to meet quarterly, and move forward from there as the work load dictates.

Next Steps

- The meeting after May 19 will be in Southern California.
- Prior to May 19 meeting, establish a working meeting on how we want to develop a standardization on course approvals.

Next Meeting Date

May 19, 2015-discuss the competencies under the headings on the Core of Knowledge for the ARF.

Recorder:

Anastasia Fotis, ACS Analyst